

own hearts, received a shock when the crucifixion took place, almost an eclipse when the burial was over. Then when He rose from the dead their recovery was joy unspeakable, and they could not make enough of the fact that occasioned it.

But the restoration of Jesus to life would have meant little to them, and it would mean nothing to us, but for the circumstance that by the resurrection from the dead He resumed the place which belonged to the Son. That He did so, the disciples could be in no doubt. For He claimed that place. His death and burial seemed to empty the claim of its reality. But the resurrection filled it again. It was a resurrection in power, not at all because it was the reanimation of a dead body, but because it placed Jesus in that position of power at the right hand of the

Father which was His by claim. And it was not long before the disciples recognized the risen life in its results. 'He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.'

And so, as there is but One who has come out of the temptations that are in the world with white garments; as there is but One who has felt and shown that unity of will with God which means Sonship; as there is but One who has made it manifest both by the consistency of His claim with His conduct and by the unbroken experience of all the saints, that He has returned to the glory which He had with the Father before the world was; for these reasons—how much more fully and persuasively expressed by Professor MACKINTOSH—for these reasons and for others, when we say *Jesus* we do not hesitate to mean *God*.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

I HAVE been greatly attracted by a book recently published by Professor A. S. Zerbe, which he calls *The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature, or Problems in Pentateuchal Criticism* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1911). Professor Zerbe is neither an Assyriologist nor an Egyptologist, but he is a good Hebrew scholar, well acquainted with the latest books on the Old Testament, and thoroughly up to date in the matter of Oriental archæology. His book is written with a candour and openness of judgment that is unfortunately rare, and the arguments and conclusions of those from whom he differs are given in their own words. I am one of the latter so far as his chief contention is concerned, as he seeks to prove that the Phœnician alphabet was known as early as the Mosaic age, and was, in fact, used by Moses himself. Hence he contests the view of myself and other Assyriologists, that a considerable part of the Pentateuch was originally written in the Babylonian script and language.

Personally, I do not think he has been successful in this portion of his work. On the one hand, it is

difficult to get over the archæological testimony, which is—at all events, at present—dead against the use of the Phœnician alphabet in Palestine before the time of David. On the other hand, he does not seem to me to have met the numerous and multiform evidences of a cuneiform original in the Book of Genesis, which I have pointed out in the pages of this journal, by the statement that similar phenomena are exhibited in the Books of Kings and Chronicles. No Assyriologist would admit anything of the kind. Even the writings of the Prophets are free from 'Babylonianisms.' And Dr. Zerbe allows that 'the foreign correspondence of Israel (in 1400–600 B.C.) was probably carried on in the Assyrian language and script.'

Like so many other recent writers, Dr. Zerbe is conservative in his views as to the age and composition of the Pentateuch. After a very searching and fair-minded examination of the theories of the modern critical school, he concludes (1) that most of the matter in J and E originated 'in the Moses-Joshua period'; (2) that 'some editor in

the age of Joshua, or not much later, wrote out Deuteronomy in substantially its present-form'; (3) that the Priest-code 'in its essentials was drawn up at an early date on the basis of sources going back to the Mosaic age.'

Another book attacking the Grafian position, but from a purely philological point of view, has also just appeared, *Wider den Bann der Quellscheidung*, by W. Möller (Gütersloh, 1912). The book is an elaborate analysis of Genesis, and controverts the whole critical hypothesis, arriving finally at the conclusion that the Pentateuch is substantially the work of a single lawgiver, Moses. Dr. Möller has little difficulty in disposing of that convenient fiction, a Redactor, or of showing how the 'critical analysis' logically ends in an almost infinite subdivision of 'sources.' He has equally little difficulty in showing that its method, if applied to Goethe's *Faust*, would divide that work among as many authors as have been discovered in the Pentateuch.

His careful examination of the use of *Elohim* and *Yahweh* in Genesis certainly makes it clear that the occurrence of the two names forms a very slender basis for the documentary theory. In fact, it does not harmonize with the present development of the latter, and Dr. Möller is justified in believing that his own explanation of the use of the two divine names is at least as good as that of Astruc. But it must be remembered that both Dr. Möller and his opponents alike rest their arguments upon the Masoretic text, and that we have no reason for thinking that this text is in any way an original one. Indeed, it is possible that the text which the Septuagint translators had before them differed considerably from it, and the very fact that it represents so uniform a phase in the history of the Hebrew language implies that it has been modernized at a period subsequent to the Exile. It is probable that the history of the text of the Pentateuch, if not of the larger part of the Old Testament, was similar to the history of the text of the Homeric Poems. And if the older parts of the Pentateuch were originally written in the cuneiform script and the Babylonian language, no conclusions whatever can be drawn from a philological analysis of the Hebrew text as it at present exists, except in so far as they relate to its translation from the cuneiform original. All that we can do is to distinguish between such portions of the work as are translations and such as are not.

All students of Assyriology should read Professor Fossey's *Présages assyriens tirés des Naissances* (Paris: Geuthner, 1912), which throws a considerable amount of light on the philology and meaning of that curious pseudo-science of prediction which flourished so abundantly in ancient Babylon. The tablets containing the omens derived from the births of men and animals are those which are translated by Professor Fossey, who has succeeded in placing full and reliable translations of them before the reader. Every possible and impossible kind of birth is enumerated in the texts, it being assumed that an occurrence that had been observed to follow a particular birth would follow it again should the same kind of birth recur. Babylonian science had not advanced, in fact, beyond the formula, 'post hoc, ergo propter hoc.' The omens, however, are full of other interests besides a philological one. They show evident signs of having been a compilation which must have extended through numerous centuries. The fundamental part of the work was composed in the time of Sargon of Akkad and his son Naram-Sin (3800 B.C.), but there are also references to the kings of the dynasty of Ur, who reigned a thousand years later. Some of the references to the Sargon period are historically interesting. One of them, which takes the highly improbable form: 'If a woman bears a pig, a woman will seize the throne,' evidently relates to queen Azag-Bau, who, as we have lately learnt from the important chronological tablet discovered and published by Professor Scheil, was the founder of the imperial dynasty of Kis. The presage is followed by two others equally improbable: 'If a woman bears an ox, the king of multitudes (*kissati*) will remain at home; if a woman bears an ass, the king of multitudes will remain at home.' Between *sar kissati*, 'the king of multitudes,' a title assumed by the kings of the Sargon dynasty and in later ages revived by the kings of Assyria and Van, and *sar Kis*, 'king of Kis,' the compiler of the omens seems to have seen a connexion.¹

The *Cornell Expedition to Asia Minor* is publishing the results of its work, under the title of *Travels*

¹ The word ES-TU, which Professor Fossey leaves untranslated, means 'supremacy'; thus we have: 'If a woman conceives and (the child) has a serpent's head, . . . supreme is Gilgames, who will rule the land while the king of multitudes remains at home'; '[If a sheep bears a lion and] it has the head of a fox, supreme is Sargon.'

and *Studies in the Nearer East*, and the second part of the first volume, containing the Hittite Inscriptions (Ithaca, New York, 1911), has now appeared, under the editorship of Messrs. Olmstead, Charles, and Wrench. With few exceptions the inscriptions are already known, and in some cases the photographs we already possess of them are better than those obtained by the Expedition. Every effort was made, however, to secure accuracy, hand-copies being taken while the squeeze was lying upon the stone, and a photograph made immediately afterwards, though it may be questioned whether a photograph from the stone itself would not have been better. 'When the inscription was of special difficulty, the squeeze was taken off a character at a time, so that the original rock and each side of the squeeze could be examined together.' We now, therefore, have the best reproductions that can be made of a considerable number of the Hittite inscriptions of Asia Minor. What is wanted is an expert, thoroughly acquainted with the forms and combinations of the Hittite script, who can examine and copy the originals themselves. Where the surface of the stone is worn, none but the experienced expert can copy them correctly. The photograph, for example, given in the present work of the Hittite inscription at Aleppo is as poor and misleading as the other photographs of it which I have seen, and the hand-copy of it is accordingly far from accurate; and yet the original is perfectly clear and legible to any one who has made a study of the Hittite characters, as I found to my surprise when I visited the monument last year.

The Expedition, however, has made two most welcome additions to our reading of the texts. The photograph of the longer Gurun inscription is, with the exception of a shadow over the left portion of the last line, a very good one, and at least enables us to read the text. But it is a pity that the hand-copy made from it was not revised by an expert, as there are a good many mistakes in it. Thus in the last line the characters *Guran-nayas-s*, 'belonging to Gurun,' which are written *Guran-yas* in a Mer'ash inscription, appear under the most fantastic shapes. The two inscriptions of Gurun, by the way, were inscribed by a king of Carchemish, Khattu-kanis, and show that the power of Carchemish once extended thus far to the north. The other welcome addition to our knowledge is furnished by the photographs of the Nishan Tash, or Beacon Stone, at Boghaz-Keui, which set at rest all question as to its having been once covered with Hittite hieroglyphs. Unfortunately, the stone is so weathered that little can be made out of them at present; whether an examination of the original by a 'Hittitological' expert would produce better results, I do not know. My visit to Boghaz-Keui the year before last was prevented by the snow. That the hieroglyphs were in use at the capital of the Hittite empire at the same time as the cuneiform characters, is proved by the fragment of a tablet which I hope to publish shortly: it contained an inventory in cuneiform of the furniture of the palace of Arnuandas, the last king of the empire, and has a docket attached to it in Hittite hieroglyphs.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

ROMANS XV. 13.

Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.

THIS ideal cannot have been an easy one for the Church at Rome to realize. In the public and private life of the city there was, it need not be said, nothing to purify heart and life, nothing to lift man up, nothing to bring him nearer to God. The first chapter in the letter gives a picture of

the state of society in the heathen world at large, and its lowest depth was touched in the imperial city. On the throne was a monster, whose name has been a synonym for brutal cruelty. The people had lost all the robustness of character and simplicity of life which once gave Rome character and strength. They refused to include God in their knowledge, and they were given up to a reprobate mind. The ghastly realism of this picture, which, even in its restraint, is sufficiently appalling, is corroborated in every particular by